

# The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day).  
Each volume contains twenty-six or twenty-seven issues.

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States.

Place of publication, Barnard College, New York, N. Y.  
Editor, Charles Knapp (Barnard College, Columbia University).  
Address, 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York, New York.

VOLUME XXVIII, No. 21

MONDAY, APRIL 1, 1935

WHOLE No. 765

## AN OVERSIGHT CORRECTED

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 28, 87-88 (January 7, 1935) there was a review, by Mr. Moses I. Finkelstein, of a monograph by Mr. A. W. Gomme. This monograph, which bears the title *The Population of Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B. C.*, was published by Basil Blackwell (Oxford, England) as Glasgow University Publications XXVIII (1933. Pp. vii, 87).

The issue of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY in which this review appears was prepared while I was working hard to get off to Lexington, Kentucky, to spend the Christmas Holidays there. Printers, too, at that season of the year are badly crowded. Somehow I failed to send to the printer the page of 'copy' which contained the last four notes to the review, and that fact was overlooked by the printer. I greatly regret all this.

I give the notes here. The mark for note 3 on page 87, column 2, line 9, should be deleted. The mark<sup>1</sup>, on page 88, column 1, line 32, should be changed to <sup>3</sup>. On page 88, column 2, line 6, <sup>4</sup> should be added after the word "bibliography".

<sup>1</sup>David Hume, *Of the Populousness of Ancient Nations*, in *Essays Moral, Political and Literary*, as Edited by T. H. Green and T. H. Grose, I. 381-443 (London, Longmans, 1882. Two volumes).

<sup>2</sup>Julius Beloch, *Die Bevölkerung der Griechischen-Römischen Welt* (Leipzig, Duncker and Humblot, 1886. <Mr. Gomme, on page 85, wrongly gives 1885 as the year of publication. See note 4, below. C. K. >. On pages 34-40 Beloch summarizes and criticizes the earlier literature of this subject.

<sup>3</sup>The inscription is, unfortunately, broken in a few places. Mr. Gomme's totals, 28, 500 *medimni* of wheat, 340,350 *medimni* of barley, are somewhat lower than those given by other scholars, e.g. by Auguste Jardé, *Les Céréales dans l'Antiquité Grecque*, I. 36-57 (Paris, Boccard, 1925. Only one volume of this work has thus far appeared), and Gustav Glotz, *Le Travail dans la Grèce Ancienne*, 308 (Paris, Alcan, 1920). Mr. Gomme cites M. Jardé.

<sup>4</sup>I note, however, that Mr. Gomme does not give names of publishers or places of publication. He always gives Christian names—even those of women—by initials only. All too often, in the Bibliography, in referring to an article in a periodical, he gives a reference like "pp. 227 ff." On page 85, we have the following entry, in the List of Books and Articles Referred to: "Sargent, R. L. *The size of the slave population in Athens. Urbana, 1925*". There is a town called Urbana in Venezuela. Towns by that name are to be found in the

following States of the United States of America: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, New York, North Dakota, and Ohio. The item should run as follows: Sargent, Rachel Louisa: *The Size of the Slave Population at Athens During the Fifth and Fourth Centuries Before Christ*, University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, Volume XII, Number 3, September, 1924, Urbana, Illinois. Pp. 136. C. K. >.

CHARLES KNAPP

## A STUDY OF DRAMATIC TECHNIQUE AS A MEANS OF APPRECIATING THE ORIGINALITY OF TERENCE

The originality of Terence and the relative merits of Terence and Menander have recently been the subject of much controversy and discussion<sup>1</sup>. Frequently this discussion has concerned itself with judgments and opinions necessarily subjective, but more tangible and concrete contributions have also been made. An article by Miss Helen Rees Clifford which appeared some time ago dealt with specific points of dramatic technique<sup>2</sup>, and the results of this article have been accepted by some<sup>3</sup>. Miss Clifford draws the following conclusion<sup>4</sup>:

... In passages which bridge over a contact with a contaminated scene or a pause devoted to the *Xopoû* in the Greek original, Terence has failed to adapt the various characters' actions to the requirements of the new drama . . .

I propose now to reexamine the cases with which Miss Clifford dealt and to consider again certain other points of dramatic technique in an effort to determine whether or not these cases really justify the conclusions which have been drawn from them. If a parallel for a given point of dramatic technique can be found in Greek drama or even in Plautus, such a point may have been accepted ancient technique, and we must at least be very cautious about censuring

<sup>1</sup>See Roy C. Flickinger, *Terence and Menander Once More*, *The Classical Journal* 28 (1933), 515-522; Levi A. Post, *Menander and Terence*, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 26 (1932), 33-36. Other articles are cited by Professors Flickinger and Post, and in the following notes.

<sup>2</sup>Dramatic Technique and the Originality of Terence, *The Classical Journal* 26 (1931), 605-618. All other references to Miss Clifford that appear in this paper are to this article.

<sup>3</sup>Roy C. Flickinger, *The Classical Journal* 26 (1931), 603, in an article entitled *Terence and Menander* (26.676-694), 28.521-522 (see note 1, above); Gilbert Norwood, *Plautus and Terence*, 115-116 (New York, Longmans, 1932); A. Klotz, in a review of Miss Clifford's article, in *Philologische Wochenschrift* 52 (1932), 358-360. Scepticism concerning Miss Clifford's conclusions is expressed by Professor Charles Knapp, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 26 (1932), 33, note 1. Miss Clifford's conclusions are not in harmony with the opinion previously accepted generally concerning Terence's mastery of dramatic technique. See Friedrich Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*<sup>3</sup>, 169-170 (Berlin, Weidmann, 1912); Eduard Fränkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus*, 277 (Berlin, Weidmann, 1922).

<sup>4</sup>618.

it in Terence. We must also be wary of drawing conclusions based on passages where the text or the action is uncertain.

Miss Clifford (611) has intimated that, when, in the *Eunuchus*, Thraso and Gnatho enter (391: compare 1025), we should expect an explanation as to the place where the two met. In my opinion, we *should not expect* any such explanation, since it is customary for two characters who are entering the stage together in conversation to omit motivation and explanation<sup>5</sup>. The reason for this convention is obvious: it might seem ridiculous to interrupt a natural conversation with such matter. So, in the *Phormio*, Chremes and Demipho enter (567) without motivation or explanation as to where they met, although it seems clear from 462 that they met at the harbor. Likewise, in the *Hecyra*, Parmeno and Pamphilus enter together (841) without telling where they met. Miss Clifford (612) also objects that, in the *Eunuchus*, Thraso and Gnatho "do not foretell any objective" when they make their exit at the close of the play<sup>6</sup>. Now the assignment of *Ite hac* to the proper speaker (1094) and the precise action there are uncertain (see the comments in Donatus), but this may result merely from the fact that our text contains no stage-direction. At any rate, the matter is too uncertain to be counted as a fault in dramatic technique. Again, I can hardly agree with Miss Clifford when she says (611-612) that Thraso and Gnatho do not name their destination when they leave the stage (816). It seems clear from 814-816 that they are going home. Miss Clifford also objects (611) that Gnatho enters (232) without localizing the place from which he comes, and withdraws with no indication of his destination (287). But Gnatho enters with a typical parasite's entrance-speech; so we should not expect any such information. One may compare the speeches of Ergasilus in *Captivi* 69-109, of Gelasimus in *Stichus* 155-195<sup>7</sup>, of Saturio in *Persa* 53-80, and of Peniculus in *Menaechmi* 77-109 (but here note 105). It must be admitted, however, that Gnatho's exit is abrupt, though hardly more so than the final exit of

Bacchis in the *Hecyra* (872). In general, it seems to me that the *Eunuchus* is an eminently successful play and a good example of successful contamination. In any event, in considering the handling of Thraso and Gnatho one must reckon with the possibility that a rival and his slave existed in the original Greek *Eunuchus*, and that the motivations and the handling of the soldier and the parasite in the play of Terence may come directly from the Greek play<sup>8</sup>.

Miss Clifford also finds fault (609-610), perhaps with more justification<sup>9</sup>, with the somewhat uncertain handling of Byrria and Charinus in the *Andria*. The abrupt entrance of Byrria (412) does certainly seem a clumsy device, though it is similar to the eavesdropping of Antipho in the *Phormio* (606-681). However, the vague localization of the action off stage, to which Miss Clifford objects, can be paralleled in certain other plays. In the *Hecyra*, Bacchis tells Parmeno to run to fetch Pamphilus (808), and, although Pamphilus has gone off without naming any destination (706), Parmeno leaves the stage (815) and soon returns with his master (841). Nothing is said as to where they met<sup>10a, 10b</sup>. In the *Phormio*, Antipho runs away (218) without naming any destination and returns without telling where he has been (465). Geta takes Phaedria to Phormio (560-566), but returns (591) without him, and bids Antipho (who was on the stage: 560-565) to go with a message to Phaedria, without telling him where to find Phaedria (712). Antipho returns without fully explaining his activity off stage (820-828). Phormio returns without Phaedria (829), but he does explain his own activity off stage. Phaedria does not appear again.

Miss Clifford (611) says that Pamphilus in the *Andria* enters at 318, without motivation, in "a purely Terentian scene . . ." This assumes that Pamphilus makes his exit at 300. This assumption is usually made by the editors, but I am myself inclined to agree with Leo and Kauer<sup>10</sup> in thinking that Pamphilus does not make his exit at 300. If this view is correct, then there is no entrance at 318 (or, rather, 310) and consequently no motivation, indeed no need for motivation. Even if the assumption of Leo and Kauer is incorrect, it is

<sup>5</sup>Compare Mary Johnston, *Exits and Entrances in Roman Comedy*, 149, 38 (Geneva, New York, The W. F. Humphrey Press, 1933. This is a Columbia University Dissertation). Similarly Günther Jachmann (*Göttinger Nachrichten*, 1921, 81-82) is not justified in objecting to the lack of explanation in *Eunuchus*, Act 5, Scene 3, where Chremes and Sophrona enter together.

<sup>6</sup>The fact that these characters do not live in one of the houses on the stage is an important factor in any consideration of the localization of their movements. In the *Mostellaria*, Callidamates enters (1122) from an unspecified place and does not name his destination at the end of the play. Compare Miss Johnston, 40-41 (see note 5, above).

<sup>7</sup>Eduard Fränkel, 288 (see note 3, above) claims that this speech of Gelasimus is not 'Attic'.

One should observe that all these speeches are the opening speeches of the characters concerned, and that several of them begin the action of their plays. Quite different is the speech of Ergasilus (*Captivi* 461-497). This occurs in the middle of the play; it contains full motivation and explanation. In the course of an article entitled *The Art of Terence's Eunuchus*, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 63 (1932), 54-72, Professor E. K. Rand says (61) that the speech of Gnatho " . . . is an amusing soliloquy, differing vastly from anything in Plautus—as it would if it comes from Menander . . ." I am inclined to doubt this, especially inasmuch as it intimates that any speech in Plautus must differ vastly from any speech in Menander. Professor Rand's statement does not, I take it, refer to form, and so perhaps does not clash with my statement above that the speech of Gnatho is a typical parasite's speech. I may be mistaken in this inference, but my essential point remains unshaken, namely that the opening speech of a parasite frequently contains little or no explanation as to the place from which he comes.

<sup>8</sup>See the literature cited by Professor Rand, 59, note 21 (see note 7, above); Jachmann, 70-71 (see note 5, above).

I had formed my opinion of the *Eunuchus* and had written the paragraph in the text above before I saw this article by Professor Rand, who holds a very high estimate of this play, and (54-55) cites others who hold or have held this opinion.

<sup>9</sup>But in defense of the handling of these characters see Fritz Schöhl, *Menanders Perinthia in der Andria des Terenz*, *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie*, 1912, 7.

<sup>10a</sup>Surely allowance must be made here, and elsewhere, for the fact that characters had eyes with which to see whither other characters went, and minds with which to draw inferences from what they saw. C. K. >

<sup>10b</sup>Compare Rudens 775-779, 839, and Miss Johnston's discussion (74) of Rudens 779-857 (see note 5, above). Miss Johnston points out (36) that the explanation of Phormio in the *Phormio* 829-830 is not entirely satisfactory.

<sup>10</sup>Friedrich Leo, *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, 240, note 11 (Berlin, Weidmann, 1913); Robert Kauer, P. Terentius Afer: *Andria* (Bielefeld and Leipzig, Velhagen und Klasing, 1930). See Kauer's stage-directions in the text, at Act 2, Scene 1, and his remarks in his *Kommentar* at Act 2, Scene 1. See also Ernest Woodruff Delcamp, *The Motivation of Entrances in Roman Comedy*, 57, note 7 (University of Chicago dissertation, in typewritten form, 1923). For similar action see *Persa* 182-200, 469-480, 776a-789 (790). On *Persa* 184 Joannes L. Ussing remarks, " . . . Sophoclidisca procul adstat" (T. Maccii Plauti *Comoediae*, Hanover, 1886).

not impossible to cite other cases wherein a character enters with no motivation<sup>11</sup>.

The action at Andria 171 is seized upon by some as the botchwork resulting from contamination<sup>12</sup>. Here Simo expresses an intention of leaving the stage, but apparently, attracted by an entering character, he remains on the stage. At least the commentary of Donatus (on Andria 173) states that Simo does not leave the stage<sup>13</sup>. It is sometimes assumed, however, that Simo does leave the stage<sup>14</sup>. Of course it is impossible to determine whether the words in 171, *i prae, sequar*<sup>15a</sup>, had an equivalent in the original Greek Andria or in the Perinthia, and whether or not there was a 'Xopoí' in either original at this point. The fact remains that the action as Terence has arranged it is not objectionable from the standpoint of established technique. There is nothing objectionable or un-Attic <or in the least striking or deserving of condemnation: C. K.> about a change of mind, or what may be termed an abandoned exit-motivation<sup>15</sup>.

Somewhat similar is the action in the Heauton, at 170, which has also attracted adverse comment<sup>15a</sup>. Perhaps a 'Xopoí' occurred here in the original<sup>16</sup>, but parallels to the action as it appears to be arranged in the play of Terence can be cited from Plautus and Aristophanes. For instance, in the Aulularia, Euclio leaves the stage for a moment (627) and then immediately reappears<sup>17</sup>. Perhaps the action in the Asinaria (809) is similar, where Diabolus and his parasite enter Philaenium's house for a moment (or, perhaps, somewhat longer)<sup>18</sup>. In the Ecclesiazusae of Aristophanes (513) Praxagora retires into her house to deposit there her husband's clothing; apparently she returns before the chorus begins the following verses (the chorus, having been commanded to change its clothes, may have gone through certain actions in her absence). In general, there seems to be no very great objection to a

short pause in the action or to allowing the stage to become entirely vacant for a moment, even when the entering character is the one who has just made his exit<sup>19</sup>. But there are similar passages where a longer pause seems to be implied. Miss Clifford cites (617-618) Heauton 873 and Adelphoe 854<sup>20</sup> as cases of awkward action apparently caused by the dropping of a 'Xopoí'. The same explanation may be offered for certain passages in Plautus, for example, Cistellaria 630<sup>21</sup>. But it seems unfair to criticize the Roman poets severely even here, first because we cannot be certain that there was not some sort of interludes in the Latin plays<sup>21a</sup>. Secondly, if there were no interludes in the Latin plays, then it is obvious that the use of the 'Xopoí' made things much easier for the Greek dramatist, and we must not censure Plautus and Terence when (and if), faced with new difficulties, they resorted to practices which the Greek dramatists did not follow, and which may perhaps be objectionable on the modern stage. In point of fact, when Euripides was confronted with a problem in the Alcestis similar to that which may occur at Adelphoe 154<sup>21b</sup>, the Greek poet solved the difficulty no more successfully. Miss Clifford points out (614) that, in the Adelphoe, Micio and Aeschinus seem to pass each other in the wing (after 154); she admits, however, that it is not certain that Aeschinus enters from the wing through which Micio makes his exit<sup>21c</sup>. In

<sup>19</sup>I venture to refer to presentations of two recent modern dramas. In Grand Hotel as presented on the stage, in Chicago, in 1931, in the middle of the first act Gaigern and Kringlein made their exit together, leaving the stage vacant. After closing the door behind them, Gaigern spoke a short line behind the scenes, and then returned to the stage. Again, in Payment Deferred, as presented on the stage, also in Chicago, in 1931, Mr. Charles Laughton left the stage vacant for a moment at the beginning of Act 1, Scene 3, and twice in Act 3, Scene 2. The last of these vacant stages appeared to me essential. The fact that such a magnificent actor as Mr. Laughton allowed the other two and that their effect upon the audience appeared altogether desirable convinces me that in the modern theater, at least, a vacant stage may be introduced very effectively. The vacant stage at Aulularia 627 also, in my opinion, would be very effective in the theater.

<sup>20</sup>The action at Adelphoe 854 is another disputed point (so, too, is the assignment of the verse). Robert Kauer (Dziatzko-Kauer, P. Terentius Afer: Adelphoe [Leipzig, Teubner, 1903]), in a note on 854 assigns the verse to Demea and says that he remains on the stage. Ph.-E. Legrand (Daos, 456, 468-469 [Lyon, A. Rey, Paris, A. Fontemoing, 1910]) says that Demea remains on the stage. So does Henr. Siess (Wiener Studien 29.94). Leo (in the work cited in note 14, above), 58 finds the end of a *meros* here. P. A. Sipkema (Quaestiones Terentianae 42, 47 [Amsterdam, J. H. de Bussy, 1901]) believes that Demea left the stage. So does F. Nencini (De Terentio Eiusque Fontibus, 142, note 1 [Livorno, "Ex Officina Raph-Giusti", 1891]).

<sup>21</sup>See Clinton C. Conrad, The Technique of Continuous Action in Roman Comedy, 81 (this is a University of Chicago dissertation. It was printed at Menasha, Wisconsin, in 1915, by the George Banta Publishing Company). <For reviews, by Professors R. C. Flickinger and A. W. Hodgman, of this dissertation see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 10.146-147, 147-151. C. K.>.

<sup>21a</sup>Compare Miss Johnston, 106-119 (see note 5, above).

<sup>21b</sup>A. Klotz, 359 (in the article named in note 3, above) assumes that there is a time inconsistency in the opening scenes of the Adelphoe. On this matter see Hans Drexler, Die Komposition von Terenz' Adelphen und Plautus' Rudens, Philologus, Supplementband 26, Heft 2, 36, note 44 (1934). This study of Drexler, in which he attempts to reconstruct the second act of the Adelphoe as it was in Menander's play, is not convincing, because, like many other recent studies in the problems of contamination, it is based on the tacit assumption that there were no inconsistencies, contradictions, illogicalities, or dramatic faults in the plays of Menander and other Greek poets of the New Comedy. For the plays of Menander this assumption is demonstrably unsound; for the plays of the others it is an extremely unlikely hypothesis.

<sup>21c</sup>Miss Johnston, 112-114 (see note 5, above) discusses this passage and Miss Clifford's treatment of it. Miss Johnston is convinced that the same wing was used by both characters, but she points out some six or seven other similar passages and concludes that there were interludes in the action of the plays. This assumption, of course, absolves Terence from the charge of faulty technique, but it is not an assumption which can definitely be proved correct. Miss Johnston cites Eunuchus 506-507 as one of the similar passages, assuming that Chremes entered from the town. I think that he entered from the country in Menander's play (see the com-

<sup>11</sup>In the Pericromene Doris enters without motivation, although there is disagreement as to the point at which she enters. In my opinion, expressed in a note entitled Menander Pericromene 160-84 (Classical Philology 28 [1933], 205-206), she enters some time before 207. In the opinion of others she enters shortly before 171. F. G. Allinson (Menander, The Loeb Classical Library [1921]) assumes that Doris enters at 187.

<sup>12</sup>Miss Clifford says (613), "... Simo's inconsistency in the Latin play as it now stands cannot be denied. ... To this we may reply that such inconsistency is common in life and on the stage, and that it adds naturalness to the action. Compare Epitrepontes 159-165.

<sup>13</sup>With this comment compare the stage-direction in manuscripts BVE of Plautus, Cistellaria 120.

<sup>14</sup>Friedrich Leo, Der Monolog im Drama, 57, note 3 (Berlin, Weidmann, 1908), assumes that Simo goes off the stage.

<sup>15a</sup>There is some manuscript authority for the reading *sequor*. A. Klotz, 359 (in the article named in note 3, above), is not, in my opinion, justified in his objection to the present tense. Compare Adelphoe 435.

<sup>15</sup>I have discussed abandoned exit-motivations in considering Pericromene 160-184 (in the article named in note 11, above). With Andria 171-174 should be compared especially Aulularia 802-807, Hecyra 358, Adelphoe 435-438, Cistellaria 531-535. It is to be noted that the originals of the last two of these plays, and possibly that of the first also, were by Menander. Of course we can never be certain that the translator faithfully followed the original.

<sup>16a</sup>Compare here Miss Clifford's paper, 615-616 (see note 2, above).

<sup>17</sup>See Günther Jachmann, Plautinisches und Attisches, 245-253 (Berlin, Weidmann, 1931); Alfred Körte, in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft, under Komödie, 11.1268; Roy C. Flickinger, Classical Philology 7 (1912), 24-34; Franz Skutsch, Hermes 47 (1912), 141-145.

<sup>18</sup><Mademoiselle> A. Fréte, Essai sur la Structure Dramatique des Comédies de Plaute, 23 (Paris, Société d'Édition, "Les Belles Lettres", 1930), writes thus: "Il n'y a pas de scène vide à 627, où Euclion ne fait qu'entrer dans le temple et en sortir pour expulser l'esclave...."

<sup>19</sup>Leo (as cited in note 14, above), 59, note 6, says: "... hier muss die Bühne leer bleiben und am Zwischenspiel ist kein Zweifel...."



the Alcestis, Admetus enters at 861 apparently from the wing through which Heracles made his exit (860)<sup>22</sup>. In such a case in Greek drama we should normally expect a chorus to intervene between the exit of the one character and the entrance of the other, but here no chorus was present; so the Greek dramatist faced the same problem as the Roman (if there was no interlude in the Latin play) and solved it, or rather failed to solve it, in precisely the same manner. Similarly, in the *Asinaria*, Argyrippus and Libanus perhaps pass each other in the wing between verses 248 and 249<sup>23a</sup>. Possibly one may compare also the action at *Asinaria* 378-380; there the character who is making his exit sees and deliberately avoids the entering character. Somewhat similar to this last passage is Mercator 218-222:

CHARINUS. —Sed quid ego hic in lamentando  
pereō, ad navim non eo?

Sequere. ACANTHIO. —Si istac ibis, com-  
modum obviam venies patri.

..... CHARINUS. —Hac ibo potius.

Demipho, the father of Charinus, enters (225) immediately after the exit of Charinus and Acanthio.

Professor Tenney Frank has suggested that the great achievement of Terence in the field of dramatic technique is his deliberate abandonment of the expository prologues in order to achieve a suspended dénouement<sup>23</sup>. This may be correct. If it is, it constitutes a large point in favor of Terence, being far more important in the history of dramatic technique and the development of modern drama than such things as motivation. I cannot, however, agree with Professor Frank when he says, with reference to *Andria* 221<sup>24</sup>:

... The *Andria*, therefore, seems to reveal Terence's first attempt at constructing a play in which a deferred hint took the place of full preparation. One wonders whether the aged Caecilius, who helped Terence with this play, may have used the device before Terence and suggested it to him.

In the passage in the *Andria*, Davus reveals a certain story about Glycerium's being an Attic citizen, and dismisses it as utter nonsense. This is a phenomenon which commentators frequently term *praeparatio*<sup>25</sup>; here it foreshadows the recognition of Glycerium as an Attic citizen. It is an exceptionally clever bit of *praeparatio* because of the skepticism expressed by Davus about the story, but there is no reason whatever for thinking that the credit for it is not due to Menander,

ment in Donatus on Eunuchus 507), and possibly also in Terence's play. Nor can I agree with Miss Johnston's interpretation of the action in Phormio 314-315 as similar to that in *Adelphoe* 154. Surely this passage in the Phormio is parallel to that in the Miles Gloriosus 1182, 1196 (compare 1281). Accordingly, Miss Johnston's contention (137-143) that Plautus is more apt than Terence carefully to work out movements *per angustiorum*, *per posticum*, or *per horum* rests on evidence too slight and too uncertain to form the basis of any generalization.

<sup>22</sup>This passage is discussed by Roy C. Flickinger, *The Greek Theater and its Drama*<sup>3</sup>, 234-235 (University of Chicago Press, 1926).

<sup>23a</sup>See Miss Johnston's discussion, 100 (see note 5, above), for a possible solution of this difficulty in the *Asinaria*.

<sup>24</sup>In *The American Journal of Philology* 49 (1928), 309-322, in an article entitled *Terence's Contribution to Plot-Construction*, Professor Frank admits the possibility that Caecilius led the way in this innovation. See also Professor Frank's book, *Life and Literature in the Roman Republic*, 104-123 (University of California Press, 1930).

<sup>25</sup>See page 318 of the article cited in note 23, above.

<sup>26</sup>I have discussed this at length in my dissertation, *Studies in Dramatic "Preparation" in Roman Comedy*, 1-12 (University of Chicago dissertation, in typewritten form, 1933).

since *praeparatio* is frequently found in Menander, Plautus, and Terence, and there is no evidence that Terence deliberately either struck out or inserted such *praeparatio*, except possibly in connection with contamination<sup>26</sup>. Such *praeparatio* seems to occur as frequently in plays having expository prologues as in those without such prologues. In the *Adelphoe* (194), Terence seems to have blundered by not striking out a phrase that quite evidently constituted *praeparatio* in the play of Diphilus from which Terence's scene is taken<sup>27</sup>. This blunder, in my opinion, indicates that Terence did not appreciate—at least on this occasion—subtle *praeparatio*, and makes it unlikely that he inserted *Andria* 221. *Praeparatio* is invariably found in one form or another in plays wherein recognition of a maiden takes place (within the body of the play). With *Andria* 220-225 may be compared *Epitrepontes* 103-116, *Eunuchus* 108-111 (see Donatus on 110), *Phormio* 114-115 (but compare 120), *Rudens* 217, and *passim*, *Poenulus* 894-900.

Günther Jachmann<sup>28</sup> has attacked the action in *Eunuchus* 922-942. Pythias had made her exit at 922. Her first words in the next scene come at 941-942. These verses, in the interpretation of Jachmann, imply that she has been on the stage for some time, and that she has overheard at least a part of Parmeno's monologue. This is not Attic technique, according to Jachmann, and it must be admitted that, in such circumstances, the entering character usually speaks some verses immediately upon his entrance, perhaps as an aside. Still, parallels to the action in the *Eunuchus* (as interpreted by Jachmann) can be cited. *Rudens* 938 is a case in point. In discussing this verse Professor Prescott<sup>29</sup> has given strong confirmation of the assumption of Marx that Trachalio has already been on stage for some time before 938, and has overheard most of the long speech of Gripus. *Rudens* 1227 may be another case, although it is not, according to the interpretation of Marx<sup>30</sup>. *Pericliomene* 207 also may be a case in point<sup>31</sup>. In the *Epitrepontes*, Habrotonon appears on

<sup>26</sup>The material presented in my dissertation (see note 25, above) seems to justify this conclusion. *Praeparatio* for recognition I discuss on pages 34-56.

<sup>27</sup>In this passage (*Adelphoe* 194) the claim is made that the girl is free. In all other extant comedies this claim occurs only when the girl is actually found, in the end, to be free, and the claim is made so frequently in various plays that we seem to be justified in assuming that for a large part of the audience it constituted foreshadowing. A claim similar to that of *Adelphoe* 194 is found in *Rudens* 217, and frequently elsewhere. Since Terence himself tells us (*Adelphoe* 11) that this scene was translated word for word from Diphilus, we seem to be justified in assuming that verse 194 constituted the usual foreshadowing of recognition in the play by Diphilus. In the *Adelphoe* it constitutes a false foreshadowing, in fact the most glaring instance of false foreshadowing of recognition that is to be found in extant New Comedy. For a further discussion of this point see my dissertation, 52, note 26 (see note 25, above). See also the discussion of Drexler, on page 5 of the work cited in note 21b, above.

<sup>28</sup>See page 83 of the article named in note 5, above. I am not myself convinced that verses 941-942 imply that Pythias had overheard any of Parmeno's immediately preceding words. The word-order varies in the manuscripts, but, in either order, *istis* must modify both *factis* and *dictis*, and the verse must be interpreted with due regard to the following verse. There is nothing in the words of Pythias to show that she is protesting specifically against 923-940.

<sup>29</sup>See Friedrich Marx, *Plautus, Rudens* (Leipzig, Hirzel, 1928), pages 174-175, in the commentary on "938 ff."; H. W. Prescott, *Criteria of Originality in Plautus*, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 63 (1932), 123.

<sup>30</sup>See his note on 1226 (in the work named in note 29, above). Jachmann recognizes the similarity between *Rudens* 1227 and this passage in the *Eunuchus*, but refuses to admit that either is 'Attic' (see pages 20-21, 32, of the work named in note 16, above).

<sup>31</sup>See note 11, above.

stage some time before she speaks 557; she is addressed at 549<sup>32</sup>.

With reference to the originality of Terence we may recall further that he presented the exposition of his *Andria* in the form of a dialogue, as had been done in the Greek *Perinthia*, not in the form of a monologue (as in the original *Andria*<sup>33</sup>), and that he substituted a dialogue for a monologue in the *Eunuchus*<sup>34</sup>. In the absence of the originals, it is somewhat hazardous to form judgments of these changes, but one can hardly doubt that, from the standpoint of modern stagecraft, these changes are distinct improvements. Another distinct advance, from the same point of view, is the elimination of direct address to the audience within the body of the play, in violation of the dramatic illusion<sup>35</sup>. Whether or not Terence is to be praised for the omission of the expository prologue is more uncertain; conclusions here must be somewhat dependent upon subjective opinion. I myself see little evidence that Terence showed any genius in adapting his plays to meet their changed condition in this regard. The *Hecyra*, for instance, may have owed its early failures partly to the fact that the expository prologue was omitted without the substitution of adequate exposition in the earlier scenes of the play<sup>36</sup>. In fact, we might even doubt whether the elimination of the expository pro-

logue was effected in order to achieve a suspended dénouement. It may have been a mere practical necessity once the author had determined to present personal apologies in his prologues<sup>37</sup>. But, whatever the motive for the elimination, certainly modern dramatists would consider the elimination of the expository prologue a distinctly forward step. They might still judge the plays of Terence inferior to their originals if he failed to adapt them properly to the exigencies of this improvement.

In conclusion, we may admit that Terence in the *Andria* handled the characters of Charinus and Byrria somewhat clumsily. But no other very serious charge, it appears to me, has been brought against his dramatic technique. If we possessed the original plays, we could draw sure conclusions, but, even then, we should hardly be warranted in censuring Terence if he failed to solve difficulties which the authors of his originals, who had presented these plays under different circumstances, did not have to face. I am unwilling, in short, to censure Terence for such action as occurs at *Heauton* 873 because of the difficulties of continuous portrayal<sup>37a</sup>. For such action as occurs at *Andria* 171, *Heauton* 170, *Adelphoe* 154 I am unwilling to censure Terence because the parallels which have been cited above indicate that some of these 'blunders' in dramatic technique may have been found in Greek originals. After all, such minutiae as motivations and momentarily vacant stages are of small concern in the history of comedy, although they are certainly important in reference to any attempt to evaluate Terence's grasp of Attic technique. But it would be ridiculous to use this as the sole criterion of his ability as a dramatist. We must consider also the important advances in dramatic technique which appear in his plays, the substitution of dialogue for monologue, and the elimination of the expository prologue and of direct address to the audience. Whether the man Terence actually originated these improvements is almost immaterial: in extant comedy they occur first in his plays (with possibly some unimportant exceptions), and it would be grudging indeed to deny him generous credit for these improvements. The early recognition of an advance is almost as praiseworthy as its actual invention. Terence is certainly not, therefore, as clumsy and uninspired as Miss Clifford would have us believe, just as he is not the original genius which Professor Norwood has seen in him<sup>38</sup>.

IOWA STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,  
CEDAR FALLS, IOWA

PHILIP W. HARSH

<sup>32</sup>Christian Jensen (Menandri Reliquiae [Berlin, Weidmann, 1929]), remarks on 549: "...alloquitur Habrotonum scaenam ingredientem". But, in my opinion, she may have entered some time before 549. She enters without motivation.

<sup>33</sup>Donatus on *Andria* 14.

<sup>34</sup>Donatus on *Eunuchus* 539 (compare comment on 607): "...bene inventa persona est cui narret Chaerea, ne unus diu loquatur, ut apud Menandrum. I should like to point out that 553-560 contain an example of apparently original Terentian humor. Somewhat similar is the humor in *Aulularia* 113-117, 182-203, and *Menaechmi* 258-262, 278-445. On Antipho and Chaerea in the *Eunuchus* see Pierre Boyancé, *Revue des Études Anciennes* 31 (1929), 314-326. See also A. Klotz (page 358 of the review cited in note 3, above).

The comment in Donatus on *Hecyra* 825 is not clear: QUID EXANIMATUS AUT UNDE: brevitati consulit Terentius, nam in Graeca haec aguntur, non narrantur (one manuscript omits *brevitati*, one omits *non*). See F. Nencini (in the work cited in note 20, above), 60; J. J. Hartman, *De Terentio et Donato*, 220 (Leyden, Sijthoff, 1895); Wolfgang Schadewaldt, in an article entitled *Bemerkungen zur Hecyra des Terenz* (*Hermes* 66 [1931], 16), assumes that the monologue of Bacchis was in the original a dialogue between Myrrina and Bacchis. If Terence actually replaced a dialogue with a monologue, he is to be censured in this case to the same extent (and with the same reservations) to which we praised him for substituting dialogues for monologues in the other cases. Professor Rand, 70-71, note 59 (see note 7, above), says: "Donatus also lets us know that Chaerea's new rhapsody at the beginning of the last scene (1031-1049) was, like his earlier one (232 ff.), a monologue in Menander's play. Terence inserts Parmeno as he inserted Antipho before. On 1034 (l. p. 483, W.): inuenta persona est, propter quam gesta hic narrat Chaerea, ut et populus et miles instruantur et sciant, quid intus gestum sit. In the *Eunuchus* no soldier and parasite—and no rival whatsoever! (see above, p. 57)—were listening in. . . ." This scholium reads very much like that on 539, and Professor Rand may be correct in his inference. But, where authorship is concerned, comments in Donatus must be interpreted with extreme care, since in Donatus *Terentius* is used sometimes as an equivalent of *poeta*, with apparently no thought of distinction between Terence and Menander (or Apollodorus). Compare the two comments in Donatus on *Eunuchus* 360 in which the expressions *poeta* and *Terentiano lepore* occur. These evidently come from different hands. Somewhat similar to the inference which Professor Rand draws here is that which he draws at 68-69, note 51; of that, too, I am mistrustful.

<sup>35</sup>See Evanthius, *De Fabula* 3.8; Leo, 80 (see note 14, above). Monologues patently designed to enlighten the audience are, however, found. Examples are *Hecyra* 361-414, 816-840. For the vocative, *populares*, *Adelphoe* 155, compare *Rudens* 615, *Menaechmi* 1900. The vocative, *o populares*, *Eunuchus* 1031, may perhaps be similar, though it is not a call for help.

<sup>36</sup>See Professor Frank, 319-320 (see note 23, above). He appears (317) to consider the insertion in the *Adelphoe* of the scene from *Dipylus* as designed to replace in part the omitted expository prologue. If this is correct, we have an instance of a successful effort to adapt the play to changed conditions, and perhaps another instance of Terence's substitution of action for narration. See also Schadewaldt, 25-29 (see note 34, above).

<sup>37</sup>Professor Frank (on page 322 of the article cited in note 23, above) thinks that Terence eliminated the expository prologue purposely. He cites here the *Adelphoe*, in which, he thinks, the fact that the girl was stolen for the supposedly virtuous brother could have been easily disclosed earlier in the play. Since it is not disclosed there, he concludes that Terence was deliberately striving for suspense.

Through the elimination of the expository prologue much dramatic irony within the plays was lost, as Professor Frank points out (*ibidem*, 313-322).

<sup>37a</sup>It is possible that there were interludes in the Latin plays. If there were, then such passages cannot be considered objectionable. Compare note 21c, above.

<sup>38</sup>Gilbert Norwood, *The Art of Terence* (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1923). See the excellent response of Roy C. Flickinger, in *Philological Quarterly* 7 (1928), 97-114.

Of course Plautus may have substituted action for narration occasionally, and vice versa. In the *Commoenantes* perhaps he substituted narration for action: see Terence, *Adelphoe* 6-11.

## REVIEWS

Excavations at Olynthus. Part 4: The Terra-cottas of Olynthus Found in 1928. By David M. Robinson. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press; London: Humphrey Milford; Oxford: University Press (1931). Pp. xii, 105. Frontispiece, and 62 Plates. \$10.

Excavations at Olynthus. Part 7: The Terra-cottas of Olynthus Found in 1931. By David M. Robinson. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press; London: Humphrey Milford; Oxford: University Press (1933). Pp. xii, 111. 61 Plates, and 3 Colored Plates. \$10.

In the two volumes whose titles are recorded above Professor Robinson furnishes a detailed account of the figurines, moulds, masks, and plastic vases of terracotta that were discovered in two campaigns of excavation (in 1928 and in 1931) on the site of ancient Olynthus.

The great numbers of the figurines unearthed, the correspondence of their texture to that of the native clay of the district, the occurrence of many moulds—in some instances along with the corresponding casts—and particularly the discovery of what appears to have been a terracotta factory on the site, provide abundant proof that Olynthus was itself a center of terracotta manufacture. But it is also evident that the Olynthians imported both figurines and moulds. The native product suffers, undoubtedly, by comparison with the figurines of Athens and Myrina, to say nothing of those of Tanagra. Besides, the Olynthian moulds were too often kept in use long after their best days had gone by, and the resultant product with its blurred outlines and even contours is notably dull and insipid. But the Olynthian coroplast was far from lacking in enterprise and ingenuity, and he not infrequently created types that are difficult to parallel elsewhere.

The second campaign at Olynthus brought to light many figurines and a few plastic vases that had been buried in tombs; the first campaign found them only in association with dwellings. These offerings to the dead—in one instance fourteen were found in a single grave—were placed sometimes at the right side of the body, sometimes at the feet, but were generally laid haphazardly in the tomb. They were contributed without consideration of the age or the sex of the deceased. When cremation was practised, they were thrown on the funeral pyre.

It is difficult to formulate a rule that will cover the employment of figurines in private houses. Undoubtedly the theory of the apotropaic motive has been carried too far. Professor Robinson is in all probability right in his desire to find in most of them a purely decorative element. In the ruins of one house at Olynthus more than two dozen were found lying on the mosaic floor, to which they had apparently tumbled from the collapsing house-walls at the time of the destruction of the city in 348 B.C.

The Olynthian coroplasts followed the widespread custom of painting the figurines in tempera, and much of the color often survives where the figure escaped too violent usage or too long a period of service before its

interment. Red is seen on the lips, brown on the hair, and blue, black, red, and other colors on the drapery.

The volumes, particularly the later, are well illustrated. The photography or reproduction—it is difficult to say which—of the later volume is decidedly superior to that of the earlier volume. The finest piece illustrated is probably the mould (and the modern cast) for a figure of Cybele (Part 4, Plates 51-54)—a charming lady were it not for her somewhat exaggerated nose. The most important figure, from the point of view of the student of art, is the 'ikon' (Plate 37), a plaque which depicts the Athena Parthenos of the Acropolis at Athens.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

A. D. FRASER

Excavations at Olynthus. Part 5: Mosaics, Vases, and Lamps of Olynthus Found in 1928 and 1931. With a Chapter on Pre-Persian Pottery, by G. E. Mylonas, A Chapter on Lamps, by J. Walter Graham, and a Chapter on Byzantine Vases, by A. Xyngopoulos. By David M. Robinson. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press; London: Humphrey Milford; Oxford: University Press (1933). Pp. xxi, 297. 18 Figures, 209 Plates. \$15.

Professor Robinson has here departed from his customary practice of recording in separate volumes the finds of each campaign of excavation at Olynthus. In this book he has written, with the assistance of three collaborators, an account of all the ceramic material, with the exception of terracottas, that was recovered in the two seasons of 1928 and 1931. With this is included, not altogether inconsistently, the pebble mosaics that were found on the site. The work is finely illustrated with eighteen Figures, thirteen and a half colored Plates, a hundred and ninety-four and a half Plates in black and white, and a Sketch Plan of the excavations.

The pebble mosaics—a technique designated by the Romans *opus barbaricum*—which were found at Olynthus appear to be the oldest of Greek workmanship yet discovered. They are composed of river pebbles of various colors set in cement. Since these pebbles are of an average diameter of six centimeters, it is obvious that the employment of such masses and blotches of color cannot produce a very delicate or subtle work of art. One is reminded *per contra* of the million and a half pieces of marble that comprise the Alexander Mosaic. But the Olynthian craftsman is bold, spirited, robust, and his technique may well suggest that of certain recent schools of art where line is subordinated to form and rhythm. It is interesting to observe that these mosaics of Olynthus are found in the chamber that has been identified regularly as the *andron* or men's room.

There is a long series of Pre-Persian pottery, decorated and plain, that is of ceramic and historical, rather than artistic, importance. These wares require much further study, since several of them are new and their chronology and affiliations are uncertain. Though the excavators do not elucidate the point, there appears to be some distinctive feature in the mica grains that



are seen in the body of the vases. This is said to be identical with the mica that is found in the native clay of the Chalcidic region. The assumption is that the great majority of the vessels that have been recovered are of local manufacture. The imported wares are mainly Corinthian and Attic. Much of the fourth-century pottery bears a close likeness to South Italic work. Professor Robinson, with some hesitation, attributes to these vases an Olynthian origin. Here, too, there is room for further investigation. That ceramic history in Macedonia should have developed, in the fourth century, along lines similar to that of South Italy during the same era is possible, but hardly likely. It is difficult also to accept Professor Robinson's suggestion that Olynthus may have exported her own wares to Italy. On the other hand, if Italy exported freely to Chalcidice, we should expect to find Italic coins at Olynthus. But none has yet been found—unless the search for them proved successful during the campaign of 1934, the results of which are as yet unpublished. Until clearer light is brought to bear on the problem, it may be fair to assume that the Olynthians both imported and imitated ceramic wares from the Southwest.

Byzantine pottery with its new and more elegant technique is represented at Olynthus by merely a few good sherds. Since these closely resemble the productions of the Byzantine Age that have been found at Saloniki, the original vessels were, in all probability, transported thence to the site of Olynthus by soldiers or workmen.

The imported terracotta lamps are for the most part Athenian. The native product is inferior in quality and in workmanship, but the collection of lamps that has been excavated provides at least an excellent series that shows the development of the art of lamp-making in Chalcidice from the sixth century B.C. till the middle of the fourth, when the city was destroyed and left in ruins.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

A. D. FRASER

### BOAR HUNTING, AGAIN

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 28, 81-84 Professor Knapp presented some interesting passages, from authors ancient and modern, upon the subject of boar-hunting. Tacitus was, no doubt, as keenly amused as modern readers have been by Pliny's account of his exploits as a boar-hunter (Epistulae 1.6).

In sharp contrast to this very tame and literary boar-hunt is Chapter IV of Lewis Freeman's fascinating book, *In the Tracks of the Trades* (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1921). On pages 79-80 we read: "The pigs are scared up in the bush by dogs and men, headed off in their flight along the narrow run-ways in the guava scrub, and dispatched by a knife-thrust between the base of the neck and the shoulder. Killing a large boar in this manner is an extremely nice piece of work, as a difference of an inch to the right or the left in plunging the knife means that the thrust will be almost harmless and leaves the hunter open to the deadly sweep of one of the scimitar-like tusks of the powerful animal. The commonest scar one sees on the body of a Marquess is a long diagonal welt of white where the flesh of calf or thigh has been laid open to the bone by the tusk of a charging boar".

One thinks of Horace, *Carmina* 3.22.5-8 *imminens villae tua pinus esto, quam per exactos ego laetus annos verris obliquum meditantis ictum sanguine donem.*

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE

HUBERT MCNEILL POTEAT

### LAST WORDS ON BOAR-HUNTING<sup>1</sup>

In the Reader's Digest for February, 1935, pages 43-45 (Volume 26, No. 154), there is an article entitled *Old Badmash Tusker*. This is a condensation (not an exact reproduction) of an article, with the same title, by Henry Morton Robinson, in the periodical called *Esquire*, *The Magazine for Men*, in the issue of January, 1935 (pages 89, 157-158). I give part of the article as it appears in *Esquire*.

"The wild boar combines in his unlovely person the characteristic qualities of a bull, a rhinoceros <sic!>, an elephant and a fox; he is the ugliest-snouted, worst-tempered, fastest-moving creature in the whole Noah's Ark of nature, and is as full of tricks as a thirteen-spade bridge hand.

At a mile he can outrun any horse in the world, and most horses raise a lather overtaking him in three. When he can run no longer he turns on his pursuers, lowers his massive head and joyously gores horses, dogs and men with his scimitar-like tusks—hooked and murderous ivories, often a foot long. His humped shoulders and muscle-sheathed neck rank him just below the bull in sheer weight-lifting strength: an angry boar can knock down a horse and rider, fling a boarhound over his shoulder like a tomato and break a heavy five-barred gate by ramming it with his skull . . .

A full-sized boar weighs from two hundred and fifty to four hundred pounds, stands three and one-half feet high at the shoulders and takes no nonsense from anything in jungle, field or forest . . . Add to this catalog of strength and savagery the fact that he is among the most guileful of animals, and you get some idea of the excellent sport that has been had hunting him through the centuries. Boar-hunting . . . is an immemorial sport in England and on the Continent; the Schwarzwald and the gloomy forests of Russia once teemed with *sus cristatus* or fighting hog . . .

The modern paradise of boar-hunting is India, where British officers and attachés—always in need of something to ride for— . . . have developed the sport into a highly-organized and very brilliant convention . . .

The Englishman in India, being a queerly casual fellow, doesn't dignify his sport by the grandiose name of 'boar-hunting'; he calls it 'pig-sticking' and tries to fob off the hazards of the game by telling you how frightfully important it is to wear the right type of pith helmet when you go for old badmash <rascal> porker . . . After listening to the average Tent Club conversation you'd think that a wild boar was a species of pink-whiskered rabbit who puts candy eggs in the pockets of little boys' rompers. But these same Britishers give away the whole show when they actually form their lines for a boar-hunt. The amount of care, time and money they lavish on fine horses, top-cut equipment and all the trappings of regular *shikari* makes one realize that boar-hunting is a serious business—often . . . a matter of life and death . . .<sup>2</sup>

It's not difficult to raise a boar in good pig country. Your beaters are all out there ahead of you, rummaging around in the . . . tall grass. Suddenly . . . the boar decides to make a run for it. . . . You'll never believe, until you

<sup>1</sup>To the subject of boar-hunting I have given much space in the current volume of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY precisely because, in the course of many years of reading of the Classics, I have not seen in the editions any satisfactory comments on the subject in notes on passages in which there are references to the *aper*, his tusks, his foaming jaws, etc.

<sup>2</sup>Many readers of these words must have seen the screen-picture *The Lives of a Bengal Lancer*. There is 'pig-sticking' in this play. One sees a rack of spears, sees and hears beaters, sees a boar-hunter unhorsed, and a hunter in serious danger from the tusks of a boar.

see him streaking along like a dark blue flash, that such a clumsy-looking object could move so rapidly . . .

If the terrain is fairly clear and your horse is exceptionally fast, you may overtake the boar in that first mile dash. Getting close to him is the warmest kind of excitement, but the second act of the drama—blooding your spear in him—is a trick that calls for ultimate courage, wind and skill on the part of horse and rider. The boar is not a fair, fat and indolent target; he is as shifty as a pickerel in eel-grass . . . He never loses his head, he thinks as he gallops, and has no intention of letting you ride up and stab him in the rump. One of his best tricks is to 'jink' suddenly, that is, swerve sharply into a yawning gully. Or, just as you rise in your stirrups to 'let him have it,' he may leap over a cliff towards which he has been nursing you for the last half mile . . .

The weapon that finally nails Old Badmash and causes him to turn with bared and foaming tusks is the boar-spear you have been carrying in your hand all during the chase. It is a bamboo shaft about seven feet long, tipped with a steel head approximately ten inches in length . . . The whole spear weighs about two and one-half pounds, and the trick of stopping a three hundred pound boar with this rather fragile instrument is something you can't learn from diagrams. The great knack is in utilizing the momentum of your horse; the spear is held rigid, and as you strike the pig, the whole weight and speed of horse and rider is *<sic!>* behind the blow.

. . . Sometimes when he comes at you crazy, your spear will go right through him; again, it may break off, and then you are likely to find yourself on the ground with a killer lunging at you, his ripper tusks adrip with frothing hatred.

In a spot like this, it's already too late to call for help. Either your friends are at hand with avenging spears, or you do what you can with the long-bladed knife strapped to your leg. Baden-Powell, greatest of living boar-hunters, tells of one quick-thinking colonel who, with the boar on top of him, held his arm for the pig to gash till help came.

. . . The hog is very brave in death, he does not yelp or squeal; he asks no mercy and surely gives none. Loving a fight for its own sake, he . . . stands at bay with his little red eyes sizzling and his great fore-trotters extended, tusks down and spine up . . .

. . . every day isn't killing-day by any means . . . After a long hide-and-seek chase over obstacles that would make a cavalry-meet seem like a parcheesi tournament, you discover that the pig has gotten away . . . while his hunters sweep past him, covered with confusion, dust and sweat . . . a season's bag of pig—twelve or fifteen spears hunting every day for months—is rarely upward of thirty, and . . . no one feels discouraged if *<only>* a dozen hard hog are speared during a long season . . ."

CHARLES KNAPP